

84-0500

Office of Legislative Liaison
Routing Slip

TO:	ACTION	INFO
1. D/OLL		X
3. DD/OLL		X
3. Admin Officer		
4. Liaison	X	
5. Legislation		
6.		
7.		
8.		
9.		
10.		

SUSPENSE

Date

Action Officer: Mary Brown

Remarks:

Joyce 2/16/84 STAT

Material reviewed by [redacted]
OGI, and corrections provided to AS
Staffer in briefing at Headquarters

STAT

SECRET



UNITED STATES GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

GAO
2-16

FEB 16 1984

NATIONAL SECURITY AND
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS DIVISION

The Honorable William J. Casey
Director, Central Intelligence
Agency

Attention: Office of Legislative Counsel

Dear Mr. Casey:

Enclosed for your review and comment is a copy of our classified draft report, U.S. and Soviet Bloc Training Offered to Latin American and Caribbean Students: Factors for Consideration in Developing Future U.S. Programs. (GAO assignment code 472019).

It is requested that your comments be provided within 30 days of the date of this letter. 31 U.S.C.718 (b) limits the period of time for comment on this report to 30 days from the date of this letter unless the Comptroller General grants an extension after the head of the agency shows (1) that a longer period is necessary and (2) that an extension is likely to result in improvement in the accuracy of the report. Written or oral comments are acceptable.

Please advise Mr. John O'Carroll (632-0602) or Mr. Joseph Hobbs (275-5790) within 15 days of the date of this letter whether written comments will be provided. If you prefer, a meeting can be arranged to obtain oral comments by the end of the 30-day period. Your designee should speak officially for the Agency.

This draft report is also being sent to the Secretaries of State and Defense, and the Director of the U.S. Information Agency, and the Administrator, Agency for International Development.

SECRET

BECOMES UNCLASSIFIED UPON
REMOVAL OF AFFILIATIONS

SECRET

The draft report is currently undergoing a security review by the Department of State to determine its appropriate security classification level. In the interim, we have designated sections of the report as SECRET as a precautionary measure. We call your attention to the notice stamped on the cover of the draft report, regarding limitations on the use of the draft report and the need for safeguards to prevent its premature or unauthorized use.

Sincerely yours,



Frank C. Conahan
Director

Enclosure

SECRET

BECOMES UNCLASSIFIED UPON
REMOVAL OF ATTACHMENTS

U.S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
REPORT TO THE CONGRESS

U.S. AND SOVIET BLOC TRAINING
OF LATIN AMERICAN AND
CARIBBEAN STUDENTS: FACTORS
FOR CONSIDERATION IN DEVELOP-
ING FUTURE U.S. PROGRAMS

D I G E S T

The federal government has provided education and training for foreign students in the United States for decades. Thousands of Latin American and Caribbean students have come to U.S. universities and other institutions for academic and technical training through programs administered by the Departments of State and Defense, United States Information Agency, Agency for International Development, and others. These federally funded programs are intended to foster socioeconomic development and strengthen political, military, and social ties with other countries. They complement private sector exchanges, which represent about 95 percent of U.S. international exchange activity.

The Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, and Cuba (Soviet bloc) have also recruited foreign students for training in their respective countries. While such recruiting

GAO/C-NSIAD-84-14

DRAFT

UNCLASSIFIED

DRAFT

COMPTROLLER GENERAL'S
REPORT TO THE CONGRESSU.S. AND SOVIET BLOC TRAINING OF
LATIN AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN STUDENTS:
FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION IN DEVELOPING
FUTURE U.S. PROGRAMS

The growth in educational scholarships offered to Latin American students by the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, and Cuba (Soviet bloc) has prompted the United States to consider expanding its educational assistance to the region. Public and private sector officials both in the United States and four Caribbean Basin countries expressed a wide range of views on the impact that students returning from training in the Soviet bloc may have on developing country and U.S. interests. Because such recruiting coupled with other Soviet bloc activities in some countries could pose future adverse implications, GAO believes the situation should be carefully monitored.

More reliable data on students being trained in the Soviet bloc and the United States is needed to better frame the dimension of the issues and design an effective response. Any new and expanded U.S. educational assistance in the region should be considered not in isolation from but in concert with other types of U.S. economic and development assistance.

GAO/C-NSIAD-84-14

DRAFT

UNCLASSIFIED

Page Denied

UNITED STATES GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
INTRAOFFICE TRANSMITTAL SLIP

UNCLASSIFIED

To: [redacted], Chief, Liaison Division, CIA Date 1/25/84

From: Joe Kelley, USGAO/NSIAD for
Carol Schuster

Subject: _____

Attached for your advance review are the Digest and selected pages from a proposed draft GAO report which will be sent to CIA and other agencies for official comment in February. CIA information is used in the report but page 8 is the only direct reference to CIA. Soviet bloc data included in the statistical chart is primarily from CIA reports. The data on military training is a composite of data provided by CIA and DIA. [redacted] in your Office of Global Issues was our primary CIA contact on this assignment.

P.S. This is the case that [redacted] and I discussed this week.

UNCLASSIFIED

Page Denied

U.S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
REPORT TO THE CONGRESSU.S. AND SOVIET BLOC TRAINING
OFFERED TO LATIN AMERICAN AND
CARIBBEAN STUDENTS: FACTORS
FOR CONSIDERATION IN DEVELOP-
ING FUTURE U.S. PROGRAMSD I G E S T

The federal government has provided education and training for foreign students in the United States for decades. Thousands of Latin American and Caribbean students have come to U.S. universities and other institutions for academic and technical training through programs administered by the Departments of State and Defense, United States Information Agency, Agency for International Development, and others. These federally funded programs are intended to foster socioeconomic development and strengthen political, military, and social ties with other countries. They complement private sector exchanges, which represent about 95 percent of U.S. international exchange activity.

The Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, and Cuba (Soviet bloc) have also recruited foreign students for training in their respective countries. While such recruiting

UNCLASSIFIED

DRAFT

DRAFT

UNCLASSIFIED

is not a recent occurrence, increased levels of Soviet bloc activity in Latin America and the Caribbean over the last 5 years have led to concerns over the large number of all-expense-paid Soviet bloc scholarships offered to students from the region.

Questions over the level and significance of these activities led GAO to undertake this study to address issues concerning:

--Past and present trends in

the level of U.S. and Soviet bloc scholarship and training activities in the region.

--U.S. and Soviet bloc approaches to providing training opportunities in terms of kinds of training offered, types of individuals targeted, and methods of recruiting students.

In examining these issues, GAO collected information and solicited views from knowledgeable officials within government and the private sector both in the United States and in four Caribbean Basin countries reportedly experiencing high levels of Soviet bloc recruiting.

UNCLASSIFIED

DRAFT

DRAFT

ORIGINAL

A PROFILE OF U.S. AND SOVIET BLOC RECRUITING
IN LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Over the past two decades Soviet bloc countries have increased their recruiting efforts, outpacing the United States in scholarship offers to developing country students. An examination of U.S. and Soviet bloc activities in the region shows that:

- In 1982 the Soviet Union and East European countries financially sponsored 16,200 students, compared with 2,145 sponsored under major U.S. training programs.
- From 1977 through 1982 Soviet bloc countries collectively increased their scholarship offers by 125 percent. Significant Cuban recruiting in Nicaragua and Soviet recruiting in selected Caribbean Basin countries contributed to the increase.
- During this same period, U.S.-sponsored training opportunities declined 18 percent because of reduced AID-sponsored training in South and Central America.

sp. (

Although the Soviet bloc leads the United States in numbers of government-sponsored students, cultural factors, such as favorable perceptions of the U.S. educational system, familiarity with the English language, and traditional ties to the United States, continue to influence far more students to privately finance their study in the United States. In 1982 over 240,000 developing

UNCLASSIFIED

DRAFT

country students were enrolled in U.S. colleges and universities compared with about 100,000 in Soviet bloc academic and technical programs.

SP. (Increased Soviet bloc recruiting in Caribbean Basin countries has recently led the United States to focus on this sub-region in providing additional scholarship opportunities.

(See pp. .)

THE UNITED STATES AND SOVIET BLOC
DIFFER IN APPROACH

The United States and Soviet bloc countries differ in their approaches^e to providing training opportunities to developing countries. These differences affect the types of individuals selected for their respective programs.

SP. (The United States emphasizes graduate level academic training and therefore seeks academically well-qualified individuals, preferably those proficient in English. Participants in U.S. programs are primarily from middle to upper social classes, are often influential in their home countries, and are selected based on their teaching or leadership potential.

SP. (Soviet bloc countries take a different approach. They emphasize technically-oriented undergraduate programs and therefore can

iv
DRAFT

select less qualified candidates. Often these individuals would prefer to study in the United States but are financially unable or not qualified for U.S. programs. Soviet bloc programs provide language training and preparatory courses to compensate for the shortcomings of less-prepared students.

VIEWS ON THE IMPLICATIONS
OF SOVIET BLOC RECRUITING

U.S. authorities as well as those in Latin America and the Caribbean perceive a wide range of possible implications stemming from Soviet bloc recruiting in developing countries. Some see no need for additional U.S. programs to counter Soviet bloc activities. Others see these activities as a serious threat to U.S. interests in promoting democratic processes in the region and urge extensive U.S. program increases and changes. While many of those who spoke to us were lukewarm on the seriousness of this matter, they nevertheless expressed suspicion about possible motives behind Soviet bloc activities and a need for better monitoring of the situation.

UNCLASSIFIED

DRAFT

DRAFT**UNCLASSIFIED**

The major concerns expressed to GAO were that:

- Stepped-up Soviet bloc recruiting efforts have led to a growing disparity between numbers of U.S. and Soviet bloc-sponsored students.
- Large numbers of individuals trained in the Soviet bloc are entering government service where they could influence future policies.
- Students returning from ideological training could bolster the efforts of Communist elements already present in some sectors of society.
- U.S. training opportunities may not offer real alternatives to Soviet bloc scholarship offers.
- The improving quality of Soviet bloc training may make these opportunities acceptable to more students as an alternative to Western educational offerings.
- Existing data on U.S. and Soviet bloc training efforts may be inadequate to assess the need for additional U.S. assistance.

UNCLASSIFIED**DRAFT**

UNCLASSIFIED

CONCLUSIONS

GAO's study did not yield conclusive evidence to suggest to what degree the United States should respond to Soviet bloc recruiting activities in Latin America. To ^{SS} assess the need for additional educational assistance, U.S. officials need a fuller understanding of the extent, objectives, and nature of Soviet bloc recruiting efforts in individual countries as well ~~of~~ as the interrelationship of U.S. public and private sector training efforts.

Consideration of increased educational assistance should be undertaken in concert with consideration of other types of U.S. ~~with~~ ~~consideration of other types of U.S.~~ economic and security assistance. In formulating appropriate actions, ^{the} Congress and the executive branch should weigh U.S. security concerns against the cost of significantly increasing educational assistance to the region. GAO believes that the Congress and the administration should consider the following matters in their deliberations over expanded training opportunities to the region.

UNCLASSIFIED

DRAFT

- Should the United States alter the mix of its programs to reach ~~a~~ different range of students?
- Can increased support for traditional U.S. training programs remain an effective response to changing needs?
- Should more emphasis be placed on in-country educational assistance?
- Can the United States employ more cost-effective methods in providing educational assistance?

Deliberations should recognize that the private sector has traditionally played the major role in international exchanges. Administrators should therefore seek to maximize the use of limited federal funds by exploring mechanisms that bolster this large private sector effort.⁹ The best U.S. response may be a flexible one which takes into consideration the unique characteristics of individual countries, extent of Soviet bloc recruiting in each country, how developed indigenous educational systems are, what U.S. programs are best suited to identified needs, and what approaches have been effective in the past.

UNCLASSIFIED**DRAFT**

We obtained data on Soviet bloc activities from (1) official memorandums, reports, and cables on file at the Central Intelligence Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, and the Department of State's Bureau of Intelligence and Research, (2) discussions with officials of these intelligence agencies in Washington and other public and private sector officials in both the United States and case study countries including high-level Caribbean Basin government officials, and (3) formal U.S. government analyses and conclusions drawn from official reports.

Information concerning U.S.-sponsored training programs was drawn primarily from (1) files and records at AID's Office of International Training and ~~AID's~~ Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean in Washington, (2) U.S. embassies and AID missions in the case study countries, and (3) discussions with appropriate officials at those locations and at the offices of major U.S. contractors. We collected statistics on U.S.-sponsored students from AID, USIA, and DOD and used those reported to USIA's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Exchange by over 30 other sponsoring agencies.

The issues and views in this report often represent a composite of statements obtained from those with whom we met. Many of the statements could not be corroborated for lack of documentation. We caution the users of the report to keep in mind that the statistical compilations and illustrations are prepared from data that were often incomplete and unverifiable. Statistics on Soviet bloc training efforts are ^{also} imprecise because:

UNCLASSIFIED

DRAFT

TEXTNAME: chp/4 (R)P: 08**DRAFT**

UNCLASSIFIED

Recruiting through Communist political parties and friendship organizations was consistently criticized more than the scholarship programs that are often handled through government channels. The suspicions are that much of the training offered in this way is ideological, granted to leftist-oriented individuals and geared toward inciting disruption rather than transferring knowledge. Developing country officials are particularly concerned over this type of recruiting because they have no control over either the content of the educational program or the students who receive the training.

Specific educational programs cited as the source of their concern included labor-related training in the Soviet Union, undergraduate scholarships at Friendship University (formerly Patrice Lumumba Friendship University) in Moscow and educational programs of all types in Cuba. U.S. officials in Washington told us that any Soviet bloc scholarship in economics or law should also be viewed with suspicion because these subjects are clearly taught from a Marxist viewpoint.

Some developing country officials fear ideological training because a Communist presence is already being felt in certain sectors of their society, particularly at universities and in some labor markets. Embassy officials in one case-study country reported that host country officials were concerned that "were not only is strong political indoctrination being implanted in the minds of young people, but that several sectors of society are in danger of being monopolized by the aggressiveness of Communist countries." Host country officials believe that

UNCLASSIFIED

DRAFT

UNCLASSIFIED

Latin American officials expressed concern over their

inability to know which students and how many were being recruited in this manner. They termed it impractical, if not impossible, to track this activity because the offers are made outside their channels and because travel to Communist countries is often done via a third country.

Another area of concern repeatedly voiced throughout our review was clandestine recruiting of labor personnel for short-term ideological training in the Soviet Union. U.S. officials in Colombia and the Dominican Republic told us that democratic labor leaders in those countries had voiced concerns that members of leftist unions go to the Soviet Union for training aimed first at producing political activists and second at teaching labor unionism.

U.S. officials in Washington said that such training is believed to be highly political which should be closely monitored. These and similar activities are reported to Washington, but we know of no in-depth analysis of such information by U.S. agencies.

UNCLASSIFIED

DRAFT